

Date: Thu, 13 May 93 10:35:00 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #142  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Thu, 13 May 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 142

Today's Topics:

  More on no-code  
  Novice/Tech Data privileges on 10m  
          Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses? (3 msgs)  
  sick of it all  
          what is the issue here? (WAS: no-code defense) (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: Wed, 12 May 1993 20:54:52 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!  
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: More on no-code  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:  
: In article <C6vxDo.JJG@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D.  
Todd) writes:  
: >: 1. Because, empirically, they don't. We already know that.  
: >                                    ^^^^^^^^^^^^ and YOU are unbiased?  
:  
: I think that if you are of the opinion that the loads on the CW and Phone  
: spectra in the amateur HF allocations are not comparable, not many would  
: agree with you, including the FCC, which has the empirical studies to back up  
: the opinion.  
:  
: >: 2. You're proposing the change, so it's \*your\* burden of proof.

: > Oh good now we're getting close! What would you like to see proven,  
: >specifically? I have never, to the best of my knowledge said it would be  
: >a good thing to completely eliminate code from licensing in the US.  
:  
: You need to demonstrate that any change that you do in fact propose will not  
: increase band loading beyond capacity. That's what the current system  
: has achieved.

Hmmm... I just can't seem to remember seeing that it is the FCC's job to  
\*minimize\* use of the amateur bands. Yes, when you say it keeps the bands  
from becoming overcrowded that does minimize the use. If you can point  
out where part 97 says that it is the FCC's job to prevent overcrowding  
the bands please post it. Does that mean they can limit the number of  
amateurs to say 600,000 that should keep the bands from getting anymore  
crowded. DO I also have to prove that my proposal, not that I've made  
any, won't cause an increase in cancer either? Or how about TVI?  
Maybe it will harm/help ozone.

> I have pointed out how ridiculous many of your arguments are. :  
: This is only your second posting in response to one of mine. I've posted  
: dozens of times on this issue, over the past nine years. Would you mind  
: being more specific as to which of my arguments are "ridiculous"?

Ridiculous argument #1:

If you want to discuss a topic you must PROVE that your idea will not  
cause increased band crowding.

That means that if I want to get more spectrum or allow another mode (SS)  
I have to prove that it won't overcrowd the bands. Or if I want to take the  
extra exam do I have to prove that I won't be the straw that breaks the  
camel's back and overflow the bands? (I realize that my taking the 4b exam  
won't require a change in rules but it will change band load)

Ridiculous argument #2:

The implied argument that the bands are not currently over crowded. They  
are overcrowded at certain times at not at other times. The same way it  
will be if the code requirement is dropped/relaxed. I have a radio that I  
turn on, sometimes I can find lots of empty spectrum and sometimes there  
isn't any empty room. The ratio

Ridiculous argument #3:

I'm empirical (perhaps should be imperial) and you're not. The FCC has  
these numbers. But Gee.. I'm not gonna say what they are. Just admit  
that it is an opinion or post the reference, UC Davis has a library and if  
it's not here I'll have them borrow it from Stanford.

That's just in this post.

But seriously I meant that the arguments that we need CW to keep out the riff  
raff, call for help when our airplane crashes etc. are ridiculous and I was

using you in the plural.

: >To claim you want to keep the bands from becoming crowded you are only  
: > showing that you wish to remain an elitist.  
:  
: Hmm, about a two on the JSMADS. ;-)

Since I haven't been on the 'net for nine years I have no idea what JSMADS means. I assume it was used to impress upon me that I know much less than you do and you are much better than me.

According to Webster (I won't give whole reference)  
elitism 1) practice of or belief in rule by the elite. 2) pride in belonging to a select or favored group. elitist, n.

It must really kill you that I'm part of the same favored group as you. Or that there are also extras who want to see the code requirement changed.

: Seriously, limiting the number of spectrum users is no more elitist than  
: limiting the number of people in a theatre due to the fire hazard.

Please tell me how a lрге number of spectrum users is equivilent to an overcrowded movie theatre. I think I'll move my fire extinguisher closer to my '530. :-)

Please make that ridiculous argument #4

: >Had you said that you don't want to see the band filled with lids and such  
: >I would have agreed with you whole heartedly. But then I would ask why  
: >you think that CW proficiency is a good and valid filter for poor  
: >operators.  
:  
: I've never argued that CW proficiency makes one a better person. Limiting  
: access to spectrum based on a willingness to learn to use a more spectrally  
: efficient manual modulation scheme, however, is clearly a fair deal.

Okay, at least I can get you to admit to that there is no correaltion between CW proficiency and operator quality! Why is CW proficiency a better way to prove a willingness to learn than say... requiring a college degree? That requires quite a bit more willingness to learn. Or how about passing a basic, college level electronics course? At least an electronics course will have some relevence to almost all hams. If tehy can't afford the class why there is another, more arbitrary method to keep the numbers down. Maybe income will fit your idea of a filter better.

Dan

--

\*-----\*

\* Daniel D. Todd Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa \*

\* Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu \*  
\* Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102 \*  
\* Davis CA 95616 \*  
\*-----\*  
\* I do not speak for the University of California.... \*  
\* and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!! \*  
\*-----\*

-----  
Date: 13 May 93 10:40:12 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!malgudi.oar.net!news.ysu.edu!  
yfn.ysu.edu!ae674@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Novice/Tech Data privileges on 10m  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Now that data privileges have been reestablished for novice/tech  
is there anybody out there who has had any luck with 10 meter packet  
and has anybody tried using PSK modems? I have one of those HTX-100's  
and am wonder  
and am wondering how well it performs on packet?  
73's  
N9SYW

--

-----  
Date: 13 May 93 08:24:40 GMT  
From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <93132.133819WKOEHLER@ESOC.BITNET> WOLF KOEHLER <WKOEHLER@ESOC.BITNET>  
writes:

>In article <1993May12.021920.107854@locus.com>, dana@spica.la.locus.com (Dana H.  
>Myers) says:

>>Once upon a time ...(stuff deleted) ... if you were in the communications  
>>business, you needed to know how send and receive CW with the available  
>>equipment at the time, which was the human hand and ear (and maybe a  
>>semi-auto key). If you didn't know CW, you were limited from a  
>>lot of business.

>

>True for business, but again you're missing the point. I maintain the  
>opinion that amateur radio is a pastime, not a business, wouldn't you agree?

>An I know the difference as I was in the business side of it.

It's true that many amateurs view the \*service\* as a passtime, like watching TV. And that's sad. However, it doesn't answer the basic thrust of Dana's point. If amateur radio is a passtime, like watching TV, then requiring Morse is like requiring mechanical turret tuners on TVs instead of modern electronic remote controls. Any TV viewer is free to fiddle with old turret tuned sets if they wish, but they aren't \*required\* to do so in order to enjoy their passtime from the comfort of their couch.

Note that I hope that the amateur radio service is a bit more useful than watching TV in it's service to the public and humanity via it's self training and innovation in electronics as well as the more direct public service aspects. Still, if some see it only as a way to idle away the empty hours in front of a box tapping a key, there's no reason to impose their peculiar requirements on everyone else.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----  
Date: Wed, 12 May 1993 16:46:46 GMT

From: gulfaero.com!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!  
othello.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

WKOEHLER@ESOC.BITNET (WOLF KOEHLER) writes:

: In article <1993May12.021920.107854@locus.com>, dana@spica.la.locus.com (Dana H.  
: Myers) says:

: >Once upon a time ...(stuff deleted) ... if you were in the communications  
: >business, you needed to know how send and receive CW with the available  
: >equipment at the time, which was the human hand and ear (and maybe a  
: >semi-auto key). If you didn't know CW, you were limited from a  
: >lot of business.

:  
: True for business, but again you're missing the point. I maintain the  
: opinion that amateur radio is a pastime, not a business, wouldn't you agree?  
: An I know the difference as I was in the business side of it.

:  
I'll buy that, but in what way does that refute the arguement that CW is an  
antiquated mode. Or are you suggesting that hobbies should not progress  
with the business side of things? I hope you have another reason for

pointing out that it is just a hobby than that. It wasn't too long ago that amateur radio was leading the way in development of SSB, EME etc. but now we should use antiquated means of communication just because we're a hobby? Since we are a hobby our communications don't need, for the most part, the kind of reliability required of commercial outfits and therefore we are, or should be, free to experiment with many different modes and equipment. While businesses require very reliable communications and should only use only the most reliable means of communication available.

I don't use the old fashioned rythm nethod of birth control either, and that is certainly a hobby. Well \*I\* don't do it professionally anyway. :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-)

Dan

---

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                   Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                   Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102              *
*                   Davis CA 95616                            *
*-----*
*       I do not speak for the University of California....   *
*       and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!           *
*-----*
```

-----

Date: Wed, 12 May 1993 20:38:48 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!news.cso.uiuc.edu!  
ux4.cso.uiuc.edu!apeters2@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

WOLF KOEHLER <WKOEHLER@ESOC.BITNET> writes:

>True for business, but again you're missing the point. I maintain the  
>opinion that amateur radio is a pastime, not a business, wouldn't you agree?  
>An I know the difference as I was in the business side of it.

you were involved in amateur radio as a business?  
doesn't that mean that you were breaking the law?  
I could have sworn that business practices were banned from amateur use...

n9oni  
avram peters  
apeters2@ux4.cso.uiuc.edu

-----  
Date: 12 May 93 22:26:49 GMT  
From: ddsww1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: sick of it all  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May10.221340.23936@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

:robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

:  
>International Treaty (of which the United States is a signatory) requires  
>knowledge of the International Morse Code for operation below 30 MHz.  
:  
>writing of their intention to do so. Also I'm aware of the process for  
>Petition for Rulemaking and will probably submit such a petition. I'm

Probably a waste of time, Todd, since at the last WARC, the United States already strongly pushed the idea of removing the requirement from the treaty. Having been UNANIMOUSLY opposed on that, they've thought it best just to bide their time and wait until the next WARC to try again (and apocryphal rumors suggest that this time they'll be trying some political pressure).

--

+-----+  
| Cliff Sharp | clifto@indep1.chi.il.us OR clifto@indep1.uucp |  
| WA9PDM | Use whichever one works |  
+-----+

-----  
Date: 13 May 93 13:26:39 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: what is the issue here? (WAS: no-code defense)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>I can't specifically say, but I believe Tony is proposing to restructure  
>access to V/UHF bands by license class, i.e. the non-coded tech would have  
>all frequencies below 147.00 on 2 meters, and coded techs would only have  
>access above 147.00. This would give non-coded techs an "incentive" (remember  
>that folks, that's what our licensing system is supposed to have...) to  
>upgrade beyond no-code.

i'd recommend studying the recently shot down Wells petition (the one to remove incentive licensing...).

the FCC is going to say that since they removed the tech limits (145-147 MHz) many years ago that they aren't going to put them back in -- especially since this sort of thing was discussed a couple of years ago (witness the ARRL's

attempt to put the line at 220 MHz and up for the code free license....)

bill wb9ivr

-----  
Date: Thu, 13 May 1993 02:10:16 EST  
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!news@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: what is the issue here? (WAS: no-code defense)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

> In rec.radio.amateur.misc kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan)  
> writes:  
>  
>>I can't specifically say, but I believe Tony is proposing to restructure  
>>access to V/UHF bands by license class, i.e. the non-coded tech would have  
>>all frequencies[sic] below 147.00 on 2 meters, and coded techs would only hav  
> e  
>>access above 147.00. This would give non-coded techs an "incentive" (remembe  
> r  
>>that folks, that's what our licensing system is supposed to have...) to  
>>upgrade beyond no-code.  
>  
> Excuse me, but where in Part 97 does it state that our licensing system is  
> supposed to have "incentives"? Or more specifically where does it codify  
> granting spectrum and privileges based upon unrelated examinations? Or is  
> a Morse code test somehow related to operating FM phone on the 2 meter  
> band? Or perhaps there is some wording in there like the current  
> administration's definition of increasing the tax on social security  
> benefits as a spending cut.

Read part 97 over again. The general licensing structure indicates that  
it's incentive licensing. And how would the examinations be "unrelated"?

> I think the IARU had it right in 1985 when they were trying to push a  
> universal two tiered licensing structure. Amateurs would be automatically  
> granted operating privileges in whatever country they were traveling and  
> there would only be \*two\* classes of licenses. One would grant all  
> privileges on all amateur frequencies and would include a code test (they  
> must have felt the ITU wasn't ready to completely drop the code  
> requirement). The other would grant all privileges on all amateur  
> frequencies above 144 MHz and would not require a code test.

Actually I think the US license structure, with a bit of modification  
would be perfect for worldwide use.



> I'll have to look back and see whatever happened to that effort. Sounds  
> like the right direction to me. This other path seems headed towards  
> requiring an attorney at your station to interpret Part 97 and verify that  
> you have proper authorization to turn on your radio. ;-)

Either that or someone with a brain, unlike you.

> 73,  
> Todd  
> N9MWB

---

Tony Pelliccio kd1nr/ae      "Usenet is like a herd of performing elephants  
\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*      with diarrhea -- massive, difficult to  
system@garlic.sbs.com      redirect, awe-inspiring, entertaining, and a  
                                 source of mind-boggling amounts of excrement  
                                 when you least expect it." --spaf (1992)

---

Date: 12 May 93 16:34:39 GMT  
From: arizona.edu!violet.ccit.arizona.edu!lester@arizona.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <QBE562E9@mmmpc6>, <C6Gu9B.K9L@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU>,  
<2290@indep1.UUCP>hod.m  
Subject : Re: sick of it all

In article <2290@indep1.UUCP>, clifto@indep1.UUCP (Cliff Sharp) writes:  
> In article <C6Gu9B.K9L@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU> jeg7e@livia.acs.Virginia.EDU  
(Jon Gefaell) writes:  
>>In article <QBE562E9@mmmpc6> hlester@as.arizona.edu (Howard Lester) writes:  
>>  
>>>Is this what you want?  
>>  
>>Do you realize you sound like a fool?  
>  
> He certainly does. He doesn't allow for the fact that his proposed test  
  
> Howard, you sound like a fool. Remove that highly discriminatory  
> requirement from your proposed test, and you've got something everyone  
> can live with.

Cliff, either I didn't get YOUR joke(?) or you (and others) didn't get mine.  
My "proposed exam" was entirely tongue-in-cheek, aimed at those who would  
propose to banish, or at least greatly reduce, the CW requirement from

amateur exams.

Howard

-----  
Date: Thu, 13 May 1993 02:13:33 EST  
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!news@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <67469@mimsy.umd.edu>, <1993May12.035635.17840@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>, <1993May12.083517.12578@anomaly.sbs.com>  
Subject : Re: what is the issue here? (WAS: no-code defense)

kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:  
>  
>>Excuse me, but where in Part 97 does it state that our licensing system is  
>>supposed to have "incentives"? [babble deleted]  
>  
> Gee, I guess that whole process I went through called "incentive licensing"  
> was just a figment of my imagination.

Nope, just a very bad dream.

-----  
Tony Pelliccio kd1nr/ae      "Usenet is like a herd of performing elephants  
\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*      with diarrhea -- massive, difficult to  
system@garlic.sbs.com      redirect, awe-inspiring, entertaining, and a  
-----                      source of mind-boggling amounts of excrement  
                              when you least expect it." --spaf (1992)

-----  
Date: 13 May 93 08:10:03 GMT  
From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May10.183640.9464@leland.Stanford.EDU>, <1993May11.153343.12666@ke4zv.uucp>, <1993May11.182530.22198@leland.Stanford.EDU>  
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)  
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May11.182530.22198@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:  
>In article <1993May11.153343.12666@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

writes:

>

>>While bit errors are a damning condemnation of HF packet, they are not of  
>>RTTY any more than they are of CW. The operator's skill in interpolating  
>>content under conditions of error applies to both. CW operators miss a letter  
>>here and there due to noise, fading, or interference just like with RTTY,  
>>but context is usually sufficient to get meaning from the signal.

>

>Unless you're running a tree code on top of RTTY, this is not the case.  
>In relying on a generic SCC to do the interpolation for you, you not only  
>don't benefit from human recognition, but you also lose the information with  
>which a human could interpolate with.

In actual RTTY practice, most burst errors result in one, or sometimes two or three, letters in a row being garbled in the printout. The human operator can usually fill these in from the context of the message just as CW operators fill in missed letters from context (though the CW ops usually have less context to work with). CW ops don't fill in bit errors either, or am I wrong that good CW ops don't hear the bits but instead hear whole letter sounds? With packet, the whole frame is discarded and must be re-transmitted. While the final text may arrive error free, it often takes much longer to complete than the slightly garbled RTTY text. A FEC scheme would be a big help with packet, but wouldn't be much of an improvement for RTTY.

>>Given that the typical HF path loss is about 140db less than the EME  
>>path, these advanced techniques should be even more effective on HF.

>

>Aside from the fact that the fading characteristics are different, you  
>have a lot less spectrum with which to spread. Also, synchronization  
>is much more of a problem, especially with F1/F2 height variance during a QSO,  
>and oh yeah, it's not cheap (if it was, there wouldn't be a market for GPS or  
>GOES clocks).

Having less spectrum isn't really apples and apples here. Because the HF spectrum spans octaves, it's wider in a sense than a UHF band. And the additional diversity caused by the varying propagation across those octaves should make it more robust, not less. That's assuming a SS system that actually uses more than one band in a discontinuous spreading sequence.

As to it not being cheap, when I started out in electronics a solid state adding machine cost \$4000. The price of the required technology has, and continues to, tumble. Advanced HF experimentation has been stifled in the amateur service, not by costs, but by regulation. Other HF users, such as shortwave broadcasters, have different priorities. Others have less spectrum flexibility than amateurs. And others have indeed overlooked new opportunities at HF as they've moved to satellite. Only the military has done any work at HF with these techniques, and

their approaches, though successful, have been rather half hearted since they invested so much in satellite links prior to the availability of practical SS equipment for HF.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

Date: Thu, 13 May 1993 07:38:53 GMT  
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!  
gary@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May11.182530.22198@leland.Stanford.EDU>, <C6vq8t.Ex5@ucdavis.edu>, <1993May11.223649.1433@leland.Stanford.EDU>  
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)  
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May11.223649.1433@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:  
>In article <C6vq8t.Ex5@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:  
>> Above all, getting back to the original topic how are you going to guarantee  
>> that the vast majority of new users won't just bypass that ("hey, that  
>> CW stuff is just too slow for complex discussion), and just overcrowd  
>> the bands with SSB? :-)  
>  
>1. Because, empirically, they don't. We already know that.

Actually, we know that they do. The majority of signals on the HF bands are non-CW, my ad hoc survey showed 15 of 80 and I'd contend that's typical, and the majority of General, Advanced, and Extra licensees are predominantly phone operators. Many used to sweat bullets when they had to \*lie\* on their renewal forms about still being able to copy Morse at their licensing requirement rate. Fortunately, the FCC deleted that question.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #142

\*\*\*\*\*